



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

1/16

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/186,810	11/05/1998	WENDA C. CARLYLE	1416.25US02	2290

24113 7590 10/22/2002

PATTERSON, THUENTE, SKAAR & CHRISTENSEN, P.A.  
4800 IDS CENTER  
80 SOUTH 8TH STREET  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-2100

EXAMINER

PREBILIC, PAUL B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3738	

DATE MAILED: 10/22/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/186,810	CARLYLE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Paul B. Prebilic	3738	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  
 If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  
 If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  
 Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).  
 Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on July24, 2002.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) Claim(s) 1,3,4,8-17 and 28-40 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 11,12,16,17,30-32,36,37,39 and 40 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) 28,29 and 33 is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1,3,4,8-10,13-15,34,35 and 38 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
     If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.  
 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All b) Some \* c) None of:  
     1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
     2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
     3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
     \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.  
 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
     a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.  
 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

***Election/Restrictions***

Claims 16 and 17 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected inventions, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in Paper No. 23 filed July 24, 2002.

Claims 11, 12, 16, 17, 30, 31, 32, 36, 37, 39, and 40 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in Paper No. 23 filed July 24, 2002.

Applicant's election with traverse of Group I in Paper No. 9 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that no additional searching burden is present for claims 16 and 17. This is not found persuasive because claims 16 and 17, which are classified in different places, would require additional searching in at least class 600, subclass 37, class 206, subclass 438 and possibly class 435.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

With respect to the election of species in Group 2 (association type), the Examiner inadvertently failed to list "crosslinking agent" as a type of association type.

***Claim Objections***

Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities:

On the last line of claim 1, the phraseology "with the substrate, and the substrate" appears redundant. Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 8-13, 15, and 34-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Upon careful review of the specification, there was found no original support for the antibody-antigen associations, specific binding protein-receptor associations, or enzyme-substrate associations as claimed. For this reason, the Examiner posits that this subject matter constitutes new matter.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 8-15 and 34-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Even if the claimed subject matter of the 35 USC 112, first paragraph rejection was found to have original support, the Examiner asserts that it would still lack antecedent basis from the specification which fails to set it forth.

***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the

unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1, 3, 4, 8-15, and 34-40 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, 4-11, 14, 15, and 21-29 of copending Application No. 09/014,087. The present claims are obvious over the copending claims because the same embodiment is set forth herein such that the claims set read on each other and are clearly obvious in view of each other.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 8, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cahalan et al (US 5,308,641) where the substrate as claimed is the polyalkylimine

Art Unit: 3738

coated tissue of Cahalan and the growth factors are coated via glutaraldehyde to it; see the entire document, especially column 4, lines 20-43 and column 6, lines 8-28.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 10 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cahalan et al (US 5,308,641) in view of Goldstein (US 5,613,982). Cahalan discloses medical devices/implants where the crosslinking agent glutaraldehyde attaches the growth factor biomolecule and to the substrate-spacer. Cahalan's solid surface can be made of human or animal tissues, but Cahalan lacks the types of tissues claimed.

However, Goldstein teaches that it was known to make similar medical devices/implants out of heart valves, pericardial tissue and the like; see the whole document, especially column 3, lines 14-24.

Therefore, it is the Examiner's position that it would have been obvious to use heart valve or pericardial tissue for Cahalan's solid surface in order to reduce the risk of disease transmission and cost over using human animal tissue. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to use these tissues for the same reasons that Goldstein desires the same.

Art Unit: 3738

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cahalan et al in view of Bayne et al (EP 0476983).

With regard to claim 13, Cahalan fails to disclose the VEGF claimed even though it discloses many other growth factors therewith. Bayne teaches that it was known to use VEGF as the growth factor in a similar fashion within the same art; see the whole document.

Therefore, it is the Examiner's position that it would have been obvious to an ordinary artisan to use VEGF as the growth factor of Cahalan so that the implant could be successfully implanted in vascular regions of the body.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 28, 29, and 33 are allowed over the prior art of record.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Gyuris et al (US 5,672,508) discloses prosthetic tissue devices (column 24, lines 49-56) using kinase inhibitors to produce them, but it fails to set forth a substrate with a tat protein attached to it.

Applicant should specifically point out the support for any amendments made to the disclosure, including the claims (MPEP 714.02 and 2163.06). Due to the procedure outlined in MPEP 2163.06 for interpreting claims, it is noted that other art may be applicable under 35 USC 102 or 35 USC 103(a) once the aforementioned issue(s) is/are addressed.

Art Unit: 3738

Applicant is respectfully requested to provide a list of all copending applications that set forth similar subject matter to the present claims. A copy of such copending claims is respectfully requested in response to this Office action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul Prebilic whose telephone number is (703) 308-2905. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Corrine McDermott, can be reached on (703) 308-2111. The fax phone number for this Technology Center is (703) 872-9301.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Technology Center 3700 receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0858.



Paul Prebilic  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3738